



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/430,297	10/29/1999	MARK SCOTT	1848.0040000	7056

7590 09/09/2003

STERNE KESSLER GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE N W SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 200053934

EXAMINER

WILSON, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2661

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/430,297

Applicant(s)

SCOTT, MARK

Examiner

Robert W Wilson

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.0 The application of Mark Scott for a “SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR POINT-TO-POINT BANDWIDTH CONSERVATION IN AN IP NETWORK” filed on October 29, 1999 was examined. Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.0 Claim 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out how to distinctly make the invention.

Referring to Claim 16, the applicant does not clearly specify how the system is “configurable to tradeoff between increase tolerance to loss and bandwidth”? Does the applicant mean that software automatically varies number of redundant frames sent versus throughput? Where is this limitation specified in the disclosure?

Claims 4 and 16-17 are rejected based upon 112 first paragraph does not point out how to distinctly make the invention.

Referring to Claims 4 and 16, How is the system “configurable to tradeoff between increase tolerance to loss and bandwidth”?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2661

3.0 Claims 5 and 16-17 are rejected based upon 112 second paragraph because the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be assessed.

Referring to Claim 5 and 16, What is meant by "regenerating missing or damaged data in a data packet"? How can the data be regenerated before it has been sent?

Claims 4 and 16-17 are rejected based upon 112 second paragraph because the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be assessed.

Referring to Claims 4 and 16, What is meant by the system is meant by "configurable to tradeoff between increase tolerance to loss and bandwidth"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.0 Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999) in view of Quarni (U.S. Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999).

Referring to Claim 1, Goldberg teaches: reducing overhead (reduce header information per Abstract); latency (latency per Abstract); voice and data over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packet (Fig 4); transmitting between originating and destination gateways in an Internet telephony system (Fig 4) ;

Compressing data streams (col 4 line 23) from a plurality of concurrent calls (30 channel of concurrent calls per col 4 line 48) into packets (larger packet per col 4 line 48. The MUX shown in Fig 3-4 performs the compression);

Art Unit: 2661

Aggregating packets into the larger packet (larger packet, ie. A Super Packet per col 4 line 45);

Transmitting data packets between originating and destination through a single virtual connection (Fig 4 shows Super Packets flowing over virtual connections between the MUXes 230a and 230b respectively. The MUXes can be integrated into the router and Gateway per col 7 lines 33-41; therefore, the virtual connections would be between the gateways shown in Fig 4);

Controlling transmission between originating and destination gateway by defining the format of the packets (Fig 4 shows originating and destination gateway. Defining packet format per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32 and synchronizing header info per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32);

In Addition:

Aggregating packets into data packets (SuperPacket per col 4 line 45); comprising at least one header frame or UDP per Fig 1 and comprising at least two header frames or version (Fig 1) and channel (col 4 line 54) as claimed in **Claim 2**.

Converting analog to digital prior to compressing (Fig 4 shows PSTN Gateway or analog into the VoIP Gateway with VoIP packet coming out; therefore, converting analog to digital) as claimed in **Claim 3**.

Transmitting a check sequence data packet at regular packet intervals (UDP checksum per Fig 1) as claimed in **Claim 4**.

Goldberg does not particularly call for: loss in a voice and data but teaches UDP per Fig 1 or col 3 lines 10-15.

Quarni teaches: handling loss of data in a UDP data environment per col 1 line 5-col 3 line 25) and Internet Telephony per col 4 line 51.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the handling of loss of Quarni to the VoIP Gateway system of Goldberg because they both are utilizing UDP protocol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2661

5.0 Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quarni (U.S.

Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999) in view of Goldberg (U.S. Patent No:

6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999)

Referring to Claim 5, Quarni teaches: regenerating missing or damaged data packet transmitted (FACs data using UDP protocol over an IP network per Fig 1. Error correction and retransmission of packets per Abstract. Also Internet Telephony is taught per col 4 line 51. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the error correction of Quarni in an Internet Telephony system because deficiencies to UDP protocol are being resolved that are also common problems in the Internet Telephony because UDP is also used)

Transmitting a check sequence after every third data packet (Frame check sequence trailer are shown in Figure 10 around four packets, 44A-44D, as well as having a frame check sequence trailer at the end of each packet. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a frame check sequence associated with three packets instead of four packets.)

Using a parity system to regenerate the missing or damaged data (error correction through retransmission of packets per Abstract or col 10 line 58-col 11 line 7).

Quarni does not particularly call for: reducing packet overhead but teaches frame check sequence and also teaches a method of correcting errors through the retransmission of packets.

Goldberg teaches reducing packet overhead per Abstract.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the reduction of packet overhead of Goldberg to the retransmission of packets of Quarni in systems that utilize UDP in order to build a system that sends a frame sequence after every third packet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2661

6.0 Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999) in view of Quarni (U.S. Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999).

Referring to Claim 6, Goldberg teaches: reducing overhead (reduce header information per Abstract) voice and data over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packet (Fig 4); transmitting over UDP connectionless protocol (col 3 lines 10-17) between originating and destination gateways in an Internet telephony system (Fig 4) ;

Media framing means for aggregating packets from a plurality of concurrent calls from a plurality of channels into the larger packet (The MUX shown in Fig 3 and 4 performs compression or aggregating of plurality of concurrent calls or channels by compressing data streams per col 4 line 23 from a plurality of concurrent calls; such as, 30 channel of concurrent calls per col 4 line 48 into larger packets per col 4 line 48. The MUXes can be integrated into the router and Gateway per col 7 lines 33-41)

Transmission control means for defining the format for the data packet and updating and synchronizing header information in the data packet (Fig 4 shows originating and destination gateway. Defining packet format per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32 and synchronizing header info per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32);

Single virtual connecting means for transmitting the data packet from the originating gateway to the destination gateway (Fig 4 shows Super Packets flowing over virtual connections between the MUXes 230a and 230b respectively. The MUXes can be integrated into the router and Gateway per col 7 lines 33-41; therefore, the virtual connections would be between the gateways shown in Fig 4);

In Addition:

Aggregating packets into data packets (SuperPacket per col 4 line 45); comprising at least one header frame or UDP per Fig 1 and comprising at least two header frames or version (Fig 1) and channel (col 4 line 54) as claimed in Claim 7.

Goldberg does not particularly call for: redundancy means for regenerating missing or damaged data in the data packet but teaches UDP per Fig 1 or col 3 lines 10-15.

Quarni teaches: redundancy means for regenerating missing or damaged data in the data packet per Abstract in a UDP data environment per col 1 line 5-col 3 line 25) and Internet Telephony per col 4 line 51.

In Addition:

Means for transmitting a check sequence data packet after every third transmission (Frame check sequence trailers are shown in Figure 10 around four packets, 44A-44D, as well as having a frame check sequence trailer at the end of each packet. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a frame check sequence associated with three packets instead of four packets. Also Goldberg taught header compression previously so it would be obvious to only utilize Frame Check sequence after every third packet) as claimed in Claim 8

Check sequence data packet is formatted to regenerate missing or damaged data with information located inside check sequence data packet and use a parity system to regenerate missing or damaged data (The frames are checked via FCS and sequence numbers are also checked to see if an error has occurred or that the frames are damaged or missing if they are damaged or missing then the frames are resent per col 2 line 28-col 3 line 25) as claimed in Claim 9.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the redundancy means for regenerating missing or damaged data in the data packet of Quarni to the VoIP Gateway system of Goldberg because they both are utilizing UDP protocol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.0 Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quarni (U.S.

Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999) in view of Goldberg (U.S. Patent No:

6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999)

Referring to Claim 10, Quarni teaches: Internet Telephony system (col 4 line 51);

Redundancy means for transmitting a check sequence data packet every third packet (Frame check sequence trailer are shown in Figure 10 around four packets, 44A-44D, as well as having a

Art Unit: 2661

frame check sequence trailer at the end of each packet. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a frame check sequence associated with three packets instead of four packets.)

Means for regenerating missing or damaged data with information located inside check sequence data packet(The frames are checked via FCS as well as associated sequence numbers and if the sequence number is missing or FCS analysis detects an error then the frame is retransmitted per col 2 line 28-col 3 line 25)

In Addition:

Parity system (col 10 lines 59-col 11 line 70) as claimed in **Claim 11**.

Quarni does not particularly call for: reducing packet overhead but teaches frame check sequence and also teaches a method of correcting errors through the retransmission of packets.

Goldberg teaches reducing packet overhead per Abstract.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the reduction of packet overhead of Goldberg to the retransmission of packets of Quarni in systems that utilize UDP in order to build a system that sends a frame sequence after every third packet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.0 Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999) in view of Quarni (U.S. Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999).

Referring to Claim 12, Goldberg teaches: reducing overhead (reduce header information per Abstract); latency (latency per Abstract); voice and data over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data

Art Unit: 2661

packet (Fig 4); transmitting between originating and destination gateways in an Internet telephony system (Fig 4) ;

A first computer program product means for compressing the data streams (col 4 line 23) from a plurality of concurrent calls (30 channel of concurrent calls per col 4 line 48) into packets (larger packet per col 4 line 48). The MUX shown in Fig 3-4 performs the compression. The MUX is a computer per col 6 line 41-col 7 line 70; therefore it would be obvious that this function is performed by a computer program product);

A second computer program product means for aggregating packets into the larger packet (larger packet, ie. A Super Packet per col 4 line 45). The MUX shown in Fig 3-4 performs the aggregation. The MUX is a computer per col 6 line 41-col 7 line 70; therefore it would be obvious that this function is performed by a computer program product);

A third computer program product means for transmitting data packets between originating and destination through a single virtual connection (Fig 4 shows Super Packets flowing over virtual connections between the MUXes 230a and 230b respectively. The MUXes can be integrated into the router and Gateway per col 7 lines 33-41; therefore, the virtual connections would be between the gateways shown in Fig 4. The MUX shown in Fig 3-4 forms the Super Packets. The MUX is a computer per col 6 line 41-col 7 line 70; therefore it would be obvious that this function is performed by a computer program product);

A fourth computer program product means for controlling transmission between originating and destination gateway by defining the format of the packets and updating and synchronizing header information in the data packets (Fig 4 shows originating and destination gateway. Defining packet format per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32 and synchronizing header info per col 4 line 44-col 5 line 32. The MUXes can be integrated into the router and Gateway per col 7 lines 33-41. The MUXes perform these functions. The MUX is a computer per col 6 line 41-col 7 line 70; therefore it would be obvious that this function is performed by a computer program product);

In Addition:

The computer program product wherein the second computer program product provides a means for further aggregating packets into data packets (SuperPacket per col 4 line 45). The MUX performs these function and a computer; therefore these functions are performed as a computer program product); comprising at least one header frame or UDP per Fig 1 and comprising at least two header frames or version (Fig 1) and channel (col 4 line 54) as claimed in **Claim 13**

The computer program product wherein the first computer program product means for converting analog to digital prior to compressing (Fig 4 shows PSTN Gateway or analog into the

Art Unit: 2661

VoIP Gateway with VoIP packet coming out; therefore, converting analog to digital. The MUX is a computer which can be integrated into the router and gateway; therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these functions are performed in a computer program product) as claimed in **Claim 14**.

Goldberg does not particularly call for: a fifth computer program product means for determining if the data packets contain missing or damaged data and regenerating said missing or damaged data in the data packets but teaches UDP per Fig 1 or col 3 lines 10-15.

Quarni teaches: a fifth computer program product means for determining if the data packets contain missing or damaged data and regenerating said missing or damaged data in the data packets (FACs data using UDP protocol over an IP network per Fig 1. Error correction and retransmission of packets per Abstract. Also Internet Telephony is taught per col 4 line 51. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the error correction of Quarni in an Internet Telephony system because deficiencies to UDP protocol are being resolved that are also common problems in the Internet Telephony because UDP is also used. The error detection and error correction algorithms utilize the protocol UDP which is utilized in computer communication; therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these algorithms could be implemented in hardware and software as a computer program product.) in a UDP data environment per col 1 line 5-col 3 line 25) and Internet Telephony per col 4 line 51.

In Addition:

The Computer Program Product wherein the fifth computer program product means further comprises computer program product means for transmitting a check sequence after every third data packet (Frame check sequence trailer are shown in Figure 10 around four packets, 44A-44D, as well as having a frame check sequence trailer at the end of each packet. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a frame check sequence associated with three packets instead of four packets. , it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these algorithms could be implemented in hardware and software as a computer program product) Using a parity system to regenerate the missing or damaged data (error correction through retransmission of packets per Abstract or col 10 line 58-col 11 line 7. , it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these algorithms could be implemented in hardware and software as a computer program product) as claimed in **Claim 15**.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the handling of loss of Quarni to the VoIP Gateway system of Goldberg because they both are utilizing UDP protocol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.0 Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038 with provisional application date of January 26, 1999) in view of Quarni (U.S. Patent No.: 6,438,105B1 dated February 8, 1999) further in view of Borella (U.S. Patent No.: 6,434,606B1 dated August 13, 2002)

Referring to Claim 16, Goldberg teaches: A computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having computer program logic recorded thereon for enabling originating and destination gateways to transmit or receive data streams or data packets in an Internet telephony system (Fig 4 shows transmitting between originating and destination gateways in an Internet telephony system. An integrated MUX/Router/Gateway performs this function. The MUX is a computer per col 6 line 41-col 7 line 70; therefore it would be obvious that these functions are performed by a computer program product); In addition Goldberg teaches reducing packet overhead per Abstract.

Goldberg does not particularly call for: configurable to tradeoff between increased tolerance to loss and bandwidth and a second computer program product means for regenerating missing or damaged data in the packet comprising; a first computer program product means for transmitting a check sequence data packet at regular packet intervals, configurable to tradeoff between increased tolerance to loss and bandwidth; and a second computer program product means for regenerating the missing or damaged data by using information located inside of said check sequence data packet

Quarni teaches: a second computer program product means for regenerating missing or damaged data in the data packet (Abstract); a first computer program product means for transmitting a check sequence data packet at regular packet intervals, configurable to tradeoff between increased tolerance to loss and bandwidth (FACs data using UDP protocol over an IP network per Fig 1. Error correction and retransmission of packets per Abstract. Also Internet Telephony

Art Unit: 2661

is taught per col 4 line 51. It would be obvious to utilize the error correction of Quarni in an Internet Telephony system because deficiencies to UDP protocol are being resolved that are also common problems in the Internet Telephony because UDP is also used. It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that increasing the amount of error correction increases the packet overhead and therefore lessens the bandwidth according to the teaching of Goldberg. Consequently it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the amount of packet overhead versus the amount of error correction in order to optimize the tradeoff between throughput and loss tolerance. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these algorithms which utilize UDP protocol which is a computer communication protocol could be implemented in hardware and software as a computer program product.)

a second computer program product means for regenerating the missing or damaged data by using information located inside of said check sequence data packet (error correction through retransmission of packets per Abstract or col 10 line 58-col 11 line 7. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that these algorithms which utilize UDP protocol which is a computer communication protocol could be implemented in hardware and software as a computer program product.)

In Addition:

a computer program product comprising a third computer program product means for using a parity system to regenerate the missing or damaged data (col 10 line 59-col 11 line 8 or col 2 line 29-col 3 line 25 or Abstract) as claimed in Claim 17

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add to the retransmission of packets of Quarni to the reduction of packet overhead of Goldberg in systems that utilize UDP in order to build a system that sends a frame sequence after every third packet.

The combination of Goldberg and Quarni do not particularly call for: configurable to tradeoff between increased tolerance to loss and bandwidth:

Borella teaches: tradeoff between increased tolerance to loss and bandwidth (col 2 lines 3-20)

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add teaching that there is a tradeoff associated QOS or loss in a real time system between redundancy of information packeted and bandwidth to the system of the combination of Goldberg and Quarni in order to build a real time system or VoIP system.

Claim Objections

10.0 Claims 18 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The closest prior art is Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038) dated May 14, 2002 and Lewis (U.S. Patent No.: 6,442, 169B1). Goldberg (U.S. Patent No: 6,389,038) teaches compression internet packets, transmission of CHECKSUMs, and transmission of control bits which define the number of smaller packets in the Superpacket. Lewis (U.S. Patent No.: 6,442, 169B1) teaches TCP error detection and correction. Neither of these references teaches whether the channel is open or online; consequently, the following limitations would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims:

“wherein said channel state identifies whether a channel is open or on-line” as claimed in **claim 18.**

“wherein step (2) further comprises the step of providing in the data packet a channel present header for indicating whether a channel is currently open and communicating” as claimed in **Claim 19.**

Response to Arguments

11.0 Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument that the reference Goldberg does not teach or suggest "aggregating said packets into the larger data packet, said data packet including information for synchronizing a current channel state at the originating gateway with a record of said channel state at the destination gateway" and "using said record to deframe the data packet". The VOIP GATEWAY (200a per Fig 3) inserts the synchronization bits in order to build a SuperPacket or "aggregating said packets into the larger data packet" per col 4 lines 51-60 so that the VOIP GATEWAY (200b per Fig 3) knows how to deframe the packets that were built into the SuperPacket. The examiner broadly interprets the limitation "synchronizing the state of the current channel" as meaning that the control synchronization bits tell how many packets are built into the SuperPacket or "synchronizing the state of the current channel".

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument that Lewis does not teach or suggest "transmitting a check sequence data packet..." or "regenerating the missing or damaged data". Lewis teaches "transmitting a check sequence data packet..." as well as "regenerating the missing or damaged data" as well as "checksum" per col 24 line 58-col 56 line 20". Lewis teaches "guaranteed delivery " per col 25 line 8. The examiner interprets "guaranteed delivery" to mean "regenerating the missing or damaged data". It is within the level of one skilled in the art to adjust parameters associated with TCP/IP in order to "guarantee delivery".

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument that Goldberg does not describe the architecture of Muxes as being relevant because this is not a claimed limitation of the applicant.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2661


CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

12.0 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W Wilson whose telephone number is 703/305-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



Robert W Wilson
Examiner
Art Unit 2661

RWW



DANG TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER